

VSP Public Comment

From: jerome444@hotmail.com
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2005 9:23 AM
To: Secretary of State, Constituent Affairs
Cc: McDannold, Bruce
Subject: Standards for AVVPAT

Should California reject the proposed Diebold system? Vote=Yes

Because the Diebold Company nationwide has been shown to be criminally undermining the American electoral process by making machines that allow criminally-dishonest electoral officials all the way up to a state's Secretary of State (Ohio) to change the code on their machines, have lied about their involvement with a political party to help engineer that change of code, the State of California should discontinue to do business with them. Certification must be denied to the Diebold GEMS 1.18.22 AV-TSX 4.6.1 Voting System with the Accu View Printer module, ES and S Tabulators - models 100 , 550 and 650. No system should have wireless or internet capabilities as most have been shown to be easily hacked and their code altered.

The AVVPAT should be printed on , at least, 16 pound paper, 1vote per sheet. All votes should have a AVVPAT copy printed , at least, in 12 point font. The AVVPAT must be organized so it can be easily read by the voter or election official. There should be no access to the voting machines by wireless or the internet. There should be a stable and permanent ink record of each vote.

Mr. John Roshek
PO Box 1521
Mount Shasta, CA 96067

Citizen Proposed Standards:

The AVVPAT shall be printed on single sheet non-thermal at least 16 pound paper, one record of vote per sheet.

Every recorded vote, no matter how recorded, shall have a AVVPAT copy.

The AVVPAT record of the vote shall be printed in a minimum of 12 point font.

The AVVPAT shall be printed and organized to be easily read by both the voter and election officials.

The AVVPAT during the 1% manual audit and any recount shall be physically verified and hand counted only.

The recorded vote choices on the AVVPAT shall not be audited or recounted by automatic or electronic methods.

There shall not be a method by which any particular voting record can be connected to any particular voter.

Any AVVPAT spoiled or rejected by a voter because of a voting system error shall not be counted as a spoiled ballot under the two spoiled ballots limit.

No remote access to voting machines by wireless or internet.